



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,796	01/07/2000	NAREN CHAGANTI	PSCO-005	2169

7590 08/07/2002

NAREN CHAGANTI
524 KENDALL AVE #5
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DARROW, JUSTIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/478,796	CHAGANTI ET AL.	
	Examiner Justin T. Darrow	Art Unit 2132	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on arguments of 08/23/2001 and 03/22/2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-43 have been presented for examination. Claims 1-6 have been originally filed 01/07/2000. Claim 1 has been amended, claim 6 has been canceled, and new claims 7-30 have been added in an amendment filed 05/19/2000. Claims 1, 5, 14, 19, 22, 23, and 25-30 have been amended and new claims 31-43 have been added in an amendment filed 11/13/2000. Claims 31-43 have been canceled in an amendment filed 02/21/2001. Claims 1-5 and 7-30 have been examined.

Docketing

2. This application has been docketed to Justin T. Darrow, patent examiner in Group Art Unit 2132 in Technology Center 2100.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/22/2002 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 08/23/2001 and 03/22/2002 have been fully considered but they are only partially persuasive.

5. As per claims 26-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, the claims do not comply with *In re Beauregard*, 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995). In Beauregard et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,710,578 A, the claims are drawn to a computer usable medium having computer readable program code to cause a device, such as a computer or a graphics display, to effect a process. Claims 26-30 in the instant application recite program instructions, themselves, effecting a process. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. See MPEP §2106 IV B. 1. (a). Concerning the recently issued patents, the claims are in a different format from claims 26-30. For example, in U.S. Patent No. 6,275,984 B1, claim 12 recites a compiler examining program instructions. The program instructions are not causing a device to perform a particular function. In fact, a process is being applied to the program instructions.

6. As per claims 1-5 and 7-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, applicants argument concerning claim 1-5, 7-24, and 26-30 not invoking 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, is convincing since step plus function language is not present for these claims. However, claim 25 uses such language in the recited steps of the claim.

7. As per claims 1-5, 14-16, and 24-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), although applicant's argument is that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., different categories of information, no correlation between the different categories of information and the different security levels, applied with any granularity, in which information objects are secured) are not recited in the rejected claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. As per claims 1-5 and 7-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), applicants suggestion of using the Masters Thesis by Naren Chaganti, dated 1992 as an affidavit to overcome the rejection based on Rozen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,106 A, represents an admission that the invention was disclosed in a printed publication (or a printed reference accessible in a library) more than one year before the filing date of the instant application and that only one of the applicants is the inventor. Naren Chaganti, "Integrating Electronic Message Handling Systems with Databases: A Security Perspective" does not anticipate all of the limitations of the rejected claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 01/07/2000 are acceptable as indicated on the attached "Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948.

Specification

9. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code in the specification page 6, line 25. See MPEP § 608.01. This objection can be overcome by deleting "available at www.opera.com," in the specification page 6, line 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the requester" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 2 and 3 and replacing with --receiving party--.

12. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the requester" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 3 and replacing with --receiving party--.

13. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the requester" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 2 and replacing with --receiving party--.

14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the requester" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 2 and replacing with --receiving party--.

15. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the requester" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 2 and replacing with --receiving party--.

16. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the requester" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 2 and replacing with --receiving party--.

17. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Some of the steps recited in claim 25 are supported in the specification, page 16,

lines 3-29 and page 17, lines 1-3. The applicant is required to point out where each "step for function" acts is to be found in the specification.

18. Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the program of instructions and the processor to perform the various recited functions.

19. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "the requester" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This rejection can be overcome by deleting "requester" in lines 2 and replacing with --receiving party--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

20. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

21. Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter and the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. Claims 26-30 in the instant application recite program instructions, themselves, effecting a process. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. This rejection can be overcome by replacing "program of instructions to" with --program of instructions causing the processor to-- in claim 26, lines 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 17, claim 27, line 3, claim 28, line 3, claims 29, lines 2 and 3, and claim 30, lines 2.

Double Patenting

22. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

23. Claim 25 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/634,725 in view of Fortenberry et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,005,939 A. The steps for inputting an authorization key to access personal information, determining a response message, and outputting a response message of claim 25 are inherent for the step of accessing an item of

interest of claim 1 of Application No. 09/634,725 (see column 8, lines 37-59 and figure 5, process blocks 508, 510, 512, 514, and 516).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

24. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

25. Claims 1-3, 7-16, 18-22, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipate by Rozen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,106 A.

As per claim 1, Rozen et al. disclose a method for disbursing a first party's personal information comprising: establishing a participant's account (see column 5, lines 49-57); assigning the participant's full name (see column 5, lines 49-57) and unique and permanent identifiers (see column 5, lines 60-63); entering the participant's personal information (see column 5, lines 49-57); different passwords in combination with the constant identifier as keys

which unlock the participant's medical information stored at different security levels (see column 5, lines 63-67 and column 6, lines 1-9); a health care provider desiring to obtain medical information of the participant providing the participant's constant identifier (see column 8, lines 16-28); determining and obtaining information that is permitted to be disclosed (see column 8, lines 54-65); and providing the information to the health care provider (see column 8, lines 59-65).

As per claim 2, Rozen et al. additionally specify the requester providing information and verifying the requester (see column 8, lines 47-59).

As per claim 3, Rozen et al. further embody the requester not having the participant's emergency PIN in which the request is rejected and the requester is connected to a customer service representative (see column 11, lines 5-12).

As per claim 7, Rozen et al. also describe generating PIN's for information (see column 5, lines 53-67 and column 6, lines 1-11) and providing them to an emergency care facility (see column 6, lines 27-31).

As per claim 8, Rozen et al. next explains creating a C-PIN in combination with the constant identifier to enable disclosure of another category of the participant's information which is of a particularly sensitive nature (see column 6, lines 6-9).

As per claim 9, Rozen et al. delineate a previously established data file of recognized emergency care facilities (see column 8, lines 47-53).

As per claim 10, Rozen et al. demonstrates an E-PIN for emergency information and a C-PIN for confidential information (see column 7, lines 4-14).

As per claim 11, Rozen et al. additionally show that the E-PIN is intended for an emergency care facility (see column 6, lines 20-31).

As per claim 12, Rozen et al. demonstrates an E-PIN for emergency information and a C-PIN for confidential information (see column 7, lines 4-14).

As per claim 13, Rozen et al. describes the type of information that can be accessed, such as emergency information with an E-PIN (see column 7, lines 4-14).

As per claim 14, Rozen et al. embody the participant adding, deleting, and updating information (see column 7, lines 15-39).

As per claim 15, Rozen et al. discusses archiving the changed information accessible by a requester with one of the PIN's and transmitting it (see column 7, lines 32-39).

As per claim 16, Rozen et al. suggest accessing the information through the Internet (see column 8, lines 14-20).

As per claim 18, Rozen et al. motivate transmitting information via mail (see column 8, lines 59-65) that is secure (see column 7, lines 37-39).

As per claim 19, Rozen et al. elaborate on different kinds of medical, biometric, and demographic information (see column 6, lines 20-48).

As per claim 20, Rozen et al. additionally specify a health care provider desiring to obtain medical information of the participant providing the participant's constant identifier (see column 8, lines 16-28).

As per claim 21, Rozen et al. also mention verifying the requester (see column 8, lines 47-59).

As per claim 22, Rozen et al. then mention prompt driven queries from the requester (see column 7, lines 48-51).

As per claim 25, Rozen et al. disclose a method for disbursing a first party's personal information comprising: entering the participant's personal information (see column 5, lines 49-57); different passwords in combination with the constant identifier as keys which unlock the participant's medical information stored at different security levels (see column 5, lines 63-67 and column 6, lines 1-9); a health care provider desiring to obtain medical information of the participant providing the participant's constant identifier (see column 8, lines 16-28); determining and obtaining information that is permitted to be disclosed (see column 8, lines 54-65); providing the participant's constant identifier and E-PIN or C-PIN (see column 8, lines 1-13); verifying the medical facility's identity (see column 8, lines 48-53); and providing the information to the health care provider (see column 8, lines 59-65).

As per claim 26, Rozen et al. disclose a program storage device readable by a processor comprising: entering the participant's personal information (see column 5, lines 49-57); different passwords in combination with the constant identifier as keys which unlock the participant's medical information stored at different security levels (see column 5, lines 63-67 and column 6, lines 1-9); a health care provider desiring to obtain medical information of the participant providing the participant's constant identifier (see column 8, lines 16-28); determining and obtaining information that is permitted to be disclosed (see column 8, lines 54-65); providing the participant's constant identifier and E-PIN or C-PIN (see column 8, lines 1-13); verifying the medical facility's identity (see column 8, lines 48-53); and providing the information to the health care provider (see column 8, lines 59-65).

As per claim 27, Rozen et al. describe identifying the entered PIN numbers (see column 8, lines 1-13)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 1-5, 14-16, 19-21, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,241,466 A in view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 4,956,769 A.

As per claims 1 and 25, Perry et al. discloses the methods for disbursing a first party's personal information comprising: establishing an account for a user in a central depository for information such as living will, with a server computer (see column 3, lines 46-64 and figure 1, item 10); assigning an identifier (see column 5, line 2); entering personal information (see column 4, lines 50-68); storing in the database the customer file (see column 4, lines 10-18 and 67-68); receiving a request message from a requester (see column 8, lines 36-44); retrieving from the database the information (see column 8, lines 58-66); and securely transmitting the information (see column 8, line 67 and column 9, lines 1-7). However, Perry et al. does not explicitly teach assigning a security level to each information object. Smith describes a security protection system for a computer database wherein users are given security profiles and the data is stored with data fields for limiting the access to users of the information stored therein (see

column 1, lines 58-68 and column 2, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the security system of the personal information database of Perry et al. by providing for assigning a security level to the information object of Smith to provide a computerized database with security against users attempting fraud (see column 1, lines 24-47).

As per claim 2, Perry et al. further disclose requester authorization and verification (see column 8, lines 45-52).

As per claim 3, Perry et al. additionally mention the requester not authorized and rejected (see column 8, lines 54-57).

As per claim 4, Smith also teaches generating an alarm if a predetermined number of unauthorized requests are detected (see column 6, lines 1-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the security system of the personal information database of Perry et al. with generating an alarm if a predetermined number of unauthorized attempts are made of Smith to provide a computerized database with security against users attempting fraud (see column 1, lines 24-47).

As per claim 5, Perry et al. moreover elaborate on recording every access to user's information (see column 7, lines 36-38).

As per claim 14 and 15, Perry et al. also describe altering and updating user's personal information (see column 2, lines 55-57; column 6, line 68; column 7, lines 1-68; and column 8, lines 1-35).

As per claim 16, Perry et al. further illustrate that the database is networked with a modem (see column 3, lines 54-57 and figure 1, items 10 and 30).

As per claim 19, Perry et al. also describe several types of personal information (see column 4, lines 49-68).

As per claims 20 and 21, Perry et al. then embody receiving an authorization request from the requester and verifying the request (see column 2, lines 43-54).

As per claim 24, Perry et al. additionally discuss a periodic status report (see column 7, lines 1-4).

As per claim 26, Perry et al. discloses a program storage device readable by a processor comprising: entering personal information (see column 4, lines 50-68); storing in the database the customer file (see column 4, lines 10-18 and 67-68); receiving a request message from a requester (see column 8, lines 36-44); retrieving from the database the information (see column 8, lines 58-66); and securely transmitting the information (see column 8, line 67 and column 9, lines 1-7). However, Perry et al. does not explicitly teach assigning a security level to each information object. Smith describes a security protection system for a computer database wherein users are given security profiles and the data is stored with data fields for limiting the access to users of the information stored therein (see column 1, lines 58-68 and column 2, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the security system of the personal information database of Perry et al. by providing for assigning a security level to the information object of Smith to provide a computerized database with security against users attempting fraud (see column 1, lines 24-47).

As per claim 27, Perry et al. further disclose requester authorization and verification (see column 8, lines 45-52).

As per claims 28-30, Perry et al. moreover elaborate on recording every access to user's information (see column 7, lines 36-38).

28. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either by Rozen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,106 A or Perry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,241,466 A in view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 4,956,769 A as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Moozakis, "Internet Printing Takes Hold."

Although Rozen et al. and Perry et al. in view of Smith disclose the method for disbursing a first party's personal information, none of these inventors show the Internet Printing Protocol. Moozakis describes IPP as a mechanism for transmission of information directly to a printer for distribution of information (see entire article). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the security system of the personal information database of either Rozen et al. or Perry et al. in view of Smith with the IPP of Moozakis an efficient manner for distributing information (see entire article).

29. Claims 18 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either by Rozen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,106 A or Perry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,241,466 A in view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 4,956,769 A as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Vaudreuil, U.S. Patent No. 5,621,727 A.

Although Rozen et al. and Perry et al. in view of Smith disclose the method for disbursing a first party's personal information, none of these inventors describe public key encryption. Vaudreuil teaches a network that transmits information securely using PEM or public key encryption (see column 28, lines 23-48) and that a network allows requests for

information to be in a form executable for database searching (see column 9, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the security system of the personal information database of either Rozen et al. or Perry et al. in view of Smith with the public key encryption and SQL executable requests for database searching of Vaudreuil in order to secure the information from other parties in order to provide for searching of a database by automated means.

Telephone Inquiry Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin T. Darrow whose telephone number is (703) 305-3872 and whose electronic mail address is justin.darrow@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barrón, Jr., can be reached at (703) 305-1830.

The fax numbers for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 are (703) 305-0040 and (703) 746-7239. Draft or Informal faxes for this Art Unit can also be submitted to (703) 746-7240. In order for a formal paper transmitted by fax to be entered into the application file, the paper and/or fax cover sheet must be signed by a representative for the applicant. Faxed formal papers for application file entry, such as amendments adding claims, extensions of time, and statutory disclaimers for which fees must be charged before entry, must be transmitted with an authorization to charge a deposit account to cover such fees. It is also recommended that the cover sheet for the fax of a formal paper have printed "**OFFICIAL FAX**". Formal papers

transmitted by fax usually require three business days for entry into the application file and consideration by the examiner. Formal or Official faxes including amendments after final rejection (37 CFR 1.116) should be submitted to (703) 746-7238 for expedited entry into the application file. It is further recommended that the cover sheet for the fax containing an amendment after final rejection have printed not only "**OFFICIAL FAX**" but also "**AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL**".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Justin T. Darrow

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100

August 5, 2002